To: **Professor Mark Lovewell, Interim Secretary of Senate**
From: **Dr. Avner Levin, Chair,**
                Policy 60 Review Committee
Object: **Streamlining of Process to Deal with Suspicions of Academic Misconduct**

The Principles of Academic Integrity
As members of the Ryerson community we stand on the shoulders of those who have taught us what they know so that we can move forward on our own. Showing respect for the ideas of others by recognizing their contribution to our learning and demonstrating how they have influenced our thinking is essential to academic honesty and the integrity of the Ryerson community.

Society can be confident that the professional services provided by Ryerson alumni will stand the test of time only if the individuals who contribute to their creation and delivery are capable of doing so on the basis of their own knowledge and expertise. Ethical behaviour predicated on academic integrity must therefore be the norm for all members of the Ryerson community whether student, staff, faculty or alumnus. This behaviour should be based on honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility – the five values that underpin academic integrity and ethical behaviour (The Center for Academic Integrity, "The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity" October, 1999).

Academic Integrity at Ryerson
The University's Academic Integrity Policy emphasizes the importance of educating community members on ways and means of achieving the highest level of academic integrity. It delineates two means for fostering an environment where academic honesty flourishes, setting out the standards required for demonstrating academic integrity, and demarcating all community members' responsibility for understanding how to achieve the highest level of academic integrity and the importance of orienting students on how to do so.

The policy also defines academic dishonesty and misconduct and the consequences which flow from such behaviour. It describes the process for dealing with suspicions of academic dishonesty and subsequent determinations. Consistent with the educational mission of the University, this policy must always be applied in a fashion reflective of our commitment to supporting individual learning and personal development; and treating academic dishonesty with the seriousness it deserves based on the principles of natural justice. This means University personnel should understand the impact of both an accusation and a finding of academic misconduct and make every effort to ensure the procedures that flow from the policy are handled in a fair, sensitive and timely manner.

These principles of natural justice must apply to all decision-making points. This means giving students the opportunity to be fully informed of the nature of the suspicion and the right to respond; and if a finding of academic misconduct is made, ensuring that it be done so on an impartial basis. In addition, all appeal mechanisms must be conducted in a timely manner and with the degree of formality that is required to maintain the principles of natural justice.

The Committee's Deliberations
Policy 60 was scheduled for review in Fall 2011 and a Policy 60 Review Committee has been meeting since January 2012. The committee's ongoing review has focused on how to streamline the way the University deals with suspicions of academic dishonesty, making the application of Policy 60 more consistent and timely for all parties, while maintaining the University's emphasis on education and our strong commitment to fostering an environment where academic honesty and freedom flourish.

We are submitting to Senate an overview of our streamlining proposal. Based on Senate's feedback, we can then proceed to a detailed revision of the wording of the policy. We believe our proposal aligns with the University's educational mission by ensuring Policy 60 would continue to be reflective of the University's commitment to supporting individual learning and personal development, while treating academic misconduct with the seriousness it deserves.

Current Process
It is useful first to summarize the present process. According to Policy 60, when suspected academic misconduct is brought to the attention of the Academic Integrity Office, the student engages in either a facilitated or non-facilitated discussion with the relevant faculty member decision-maker. If, as a result of this discussion, it is deemed that academic misconduct has occurred, the Registrar assigns a disciplinary notice. For course-specific cases, at a minimum a grade of zero is assigned for the relevant work but there are stricter penalties available if the faculty member feels it is warranted.

At the second level of the current process, students have the right to appeal the faculty member's decision to an Academic Integrity Council Hearing Panel. In cases where the faculty member recommends a disciplinary suspension, disciplinary withdrawal, or expulsion, the appeal to the Academic Integrity Council Hearing Panel is automatic. At the next and final level, the student may appeal the Academic Integrity Council Hearing Panel's decision to a Senate Appeals Committee Panel. In cases where the Academic Integrity Council has recommended disciplinary withdrawal or expulsion, the appeal to the Senate Appeals Committee Panel is automatic.

Proposed Process
The Policy 60 Review Committee's proposed process begins with the option of a faculty-student discussion, which in some instances will result in a resolution. Cases with no resolution would be referred to the Academic Integrity Office. Faculty members would have the option of sending a case directly to the Academic Integrity Office without an initial discussion with the student. Regardless of the particular path chosen, faculty members and students could consult with the Academic Integrity Office at any time.

In cases where faculty members elected to discuss matters directly with the student, they could impose penalties of at most x% of the total course grade (with x yet to be determined), and only if the student admitted to having committed the academic misconduct. All other cases would be referred to the Academic Integrity Office. However, even in cases resolved in the context of the faculty-student discussion, the instance of academic misconduct would be sent to the Academic Integrity Office and recorded in a confidential and secure central data base which would enable the Academic Integrity Office to track individual students and thus deal with repeat offenders.

If and when a case reached the level of an interview with the Academic Integrity Office, the student would have the right to have an advocate (ie. support person, student advocate or legal counsel). If students did not agree with either the finding of misconduct or the particular penalty imposed (or both), they would have the right to appeal to a Senate Appeals Committee Panel. At this stage, students would again have the right to a support person, student advocate or legal counsel. Where a student's disciplinary suspension, withdrawal or expulsion was the imposed penalty, there would be a final option to appeal to the Provost or Provost's designate. While this process explicitly recognizes a possible role for legal counsel, we are committed to establishing procedures that will establish the facts of the case and are as nonadversarial as possible.

This entire process would be overseen by a Senate Committee on Academic Integrity, which would receive and review an annual report from the Academic Integrity Office, appoint the Senate Appeals Committee Panel members and ensure they were adequately trained. The Senate Committee on Academic Integrity would also receive all panel hearing outcomes and report annually to Senate.

Education would be an important component of the policy, with a requirement for mandatory education on the policy and on academic integrity in general for the Ryerson community.

Similarities and Differences
One similarity between the current and proposed processes is that both could begin with faculty/student interaction. Another is that both processes involve the same form of Senate appeal. Finally, both processes stress the importance of education of students and faculty members by the Academic Integrity Office, with the Office's role also including the provision of advice on policy and procedures to the community and keeping records.

An important difference is that in the proposed process there would be a wide range of penalties, from reprimand to expulsion. However, even in instances of the most minor penalties, there would be a record of the case. In some instances, a discussion between faculty member and student would result in a resolution. All cases still contested after this discussion, as well as those cases where the faculty member or the student waived the right to the discussion, would be referred to the Academic Integrity Office. In the proposed process, the faculty member would not be able to decide unilaterally on a student's "guilt" or "innocence", and in instances where resolution was found, the faculty member could impose penalties only less than a certain percentage of the total course grade. The facilitated discussion of the current process would be replaced by a formal interview in which the Academic Integrity Office would have the authority to determine if the allegation of academic misconduct was founded and, if so, what the penalty should be, and with a process that explicitly allows for a student to have a support person, student advocate or legal counsel.

Unlike the current process, the proposed process would be overseen by a Senate Committee on Academic Integrity, with this body issuing annual reports to the community. Moreover, in the proposed process only instances of disciplinary suspension, withdrawal and expulsion would be on the student record, while the current disciplinary notice would disappear. The Academic Integrity Office would gain a more central role, conducting a formal interview with the faculty member and student in contested cases, and with decision-making authority over "guilt" or "innocence" as well as the right to determine all penalties more than a certain percentage of the

total course grade. In addition, the Academic Integrity Office would track all findings and penalties in a private and confidential central database.

Motion
The Policy 60 Review Committee sees these proposed new features as significant and beneficial to the University's implementation of principles of Academic Integrity. At the Committee's May 11th meeting it was unanimously agreed that Senate approve this streamlined procedural framework, which would then serve as the basis for the Committee's ongoing review of Senate Policy 60.

TO: Mark Lovewell
           Interim Secretary of Senate

FROM: Vaness Magness
           Interim Chair of Accounting Department, TRSM

Date: May 14, 2012

SUBJECT: SAF BYLAW

I'm going to respond on Daria Sydor's behalf, as I'm currently serving as the interim Chair of the Accounting Department. I'll also speak for Dr. Goss - Chair of Finance - as I am familiar with his views.

Our original draft of the proposed bylaws specified the Council Chair position would rotate from meeting to meeting. Members in both the accounting and finance departments were comfortable with this proposal. When we submitted our draft to Diane Schulman, back in January, she told us that she believed the position of Chair should rotate on an annual basis. We revised our proposal in accordance with her recommendation. (In truth, I don't recall whether it was her own recommendation, or the recommendation of the existing AGPC members at that time.)

Your committee members have suggested that the position of Chair rotate on a biannual basis. Dr. Goss feels this is too much of a change from the position his department had originally agreed to, and that it would be necessary to go back to all the members again before he can, in good conscience, agree to the new change. I agree with Dr. Goss's concerns, but I have an additional view regarding the comments that you provide in your email below. You say the AGPC members feel that having the Council chairship rotate every year fails to give the incumbent time to become comfortable in the role. Personally, I don't believe this is the case. It is highly unlikely that the incumbent will assume the position of Chair without some previous history as a committee chair. He or she will have been a departmental chair, or will have chaired some other Ryerson council or committee. I don't feel that anyone with experience of this nature requires 2 years to become accustomed to the role of Chair for this particular committee.

A Proposal to the Governance Committee of Senate

for

The Ted Rogers School of Management School of Accounting and Finance Bylaws

The Ted Rogers School of Management School of Accounting and Finance Bylaws

TABLE of Contents

1. **Definitions**
   a. Dean – the Dean of the Faculty of Business
   b. SAF – the School of Accounting and Finance
   c. SBM – the School of Business Management
   d. Common/Core Curriculum refers to that part of the curriculum that is common to and required for all students in the SAF
   e. Department Council(s) refers to either of or both of the Accounting and Finance Department councils
   f. SBM Council – the School of Business Management council
   g. Department(s) refers to either of or both of the Accounting and Finance departments
   h. Department Chair(s) refers to either of or both of the Accounting and Finance Department Chairs
   i. Chair of Department Council – the Chair of the Department Council as defined by these bylaws.
   j. Full-time Faculty – full-time faculty members including Limited Term Faculty from one or both of the Accounting and Finance Departments
   k. Members – Members of the SAF Council.
   l. Sessionals – Part-time instructors teaching in one or both of the Accounting and Finance departments and who are members of a CUPE bargaining unit.
   m. Undergraduate Students – students who have registered in the SAF.
   n. Students - undergraduate students in Bachelor of Commerce program
   o. Academic Year – the twelve month period beginning September 1st

2. **Governance of SAF Council**
   a. Mandate
      The SAF Council will discuss and, where appropriate, make decisions on matters relating to
      - the mission of the SAF;
      - other Schools within the TRSM;
      - common/core curriculum;
      - matters related to admissions criteria for the SAF;

- graduate programs to be referred to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council, as well as other programs that are not part of the undergraduate SAF program (i.e. professional development, executive development, certificate and other non-degree programs)
- research;
- the Advisory Council for the SAF and any future student internship or other placement programs for the SAF;
- the transfer of students into or out of the SAF and or between disciplines within the SAF;
- student engagement and student affairs as they relate to the SAF (i.e. awards/appeals);
- majors and minors offered to students of the SAF, unless these programs are governed by another governing bodies;
- sub-committees of SAF Council, both standing and ad hoc;
- other matters as agreed according to a vote of this Council.

b. Composition and duration of term
   i. The Chair of SAF Council will alternate on a yearly basis between Departmental Chairs.
   ii. The Administrative Assistant to the Departmental Chair who is serving as SAF Chair will be Secretary of SAF Council.
   iii. Membership includes
      - all full-time faculty members, including the SAF Chair;
      - undergraduate students not less than one third times the number of full-time faculty members[1], elected by and from each department's student body; and,
      - a minimum of one and up to three Sessionals per Department, elected by the Sessionals.
   iv. Elected members will serve for one Academic Year and are limited to two consecutive Academic Years.

c. Voting
   i. A quorum of at least half of the voting members from each Department is required for a vote.
   ii. No absentee or proxy voting is permitted.
   iii. All members as defined in Section 2b(iii) are voting members.
   iv. For any proposal to pass, a majority of members from each department must support the proposal[2]. If the votes within one Departmental are tied, the Chair of that department is accorded a second vote.
   v. The Chair may ask all non-voting attendees to leave the room during a vote.

---

[1] For example, if Finance has 10 full-time faculty members and Accounting has 6 full-time faculty members then up to 4 Finance students and 2 Accounting students.

[2] For example, if there are 6 accounting members at a meeting and 9 finance members, and the vote on a proposal is 3 accounting yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, and 8 finance yes and 1 abstain, the proposal will not pass because a majority of accounting members at the meeting did not vote "yes". Only 3 of 6 voted yes.

vi. Voting will normally be by show of hands, however, any member can request a secret ballot, in which case the Secretary of the meeting and Departmental Chairs will confirm the result.

d. Procedures
   i. SAF Council meetings will be called at least twice per academic year, the dates and times to be set at the start of each year. Additional meetings can be scheduled at the request of either Departmental Chair.
   ii. The SAF Chair can delegate responsibility for chairing a meeting of SAF to any full-time faculty member.
   iii. The Chair of a meeting will determine the agenda and the order of discussion. Anyone can bring up an agenda item with the Chair but only members and the Dean can require that an item be put on the agenda.
   iv. Meetings will normally be open to non-members.
   v. The role of the Secretary is to
      • provide notice of meetings at least two weeks before meeting, and the agenda at least 3 days before the meeting;
      • attend meetings, prepare, edit, and distribute minutes; and,
      • maintain all SAF documentation.
   vi. SAF Council meetings will follow the Senate's Rules of Order, however the Chair of the meeting has the authority to limit discussion on any topic.

e. SAF Sub-Committees[3]
   i. Standing and ad hoc sub-committees can include but are not limited to the following: governance, curriculum, research, student engagement, transition, graduate programs, and school mission.
   ii. The Curriculum Sub-Committee will provide a written annual report on its work to the SAF at the last SAF Council meeting of the year.
   iii. The Sub-Committee Chair will be responsible for calling and conducting sub-committee meetings, and for reporting back to SAF Council in a timely manner.
   iv. Quorum is two thirds of the sub-committee members.
   v. A full-time faculty member or sessional must be elected (by simple majority) to chair a sub-committee.
   vi. Composition and duration of term:
      a) There must be an equal number of SAF members from each Department. Non-members may be asked to participate on a consultative basis.
      b) A sub-committee member's service is limited to two-years, unless no other member from his or her Department wishes to take the position.
      c) The Chairs of each department must sit on any Governance Sub-Committee.

---

[3] Senate Policy 45 governs the composition of a Curriculum Subcommittee of School Council. Clause 2e(ii) above deals with all sub-committees of SAF Council. Should any policy for any SAF sub-committee conflict with Policy 45, the Senate policy will take precedence.

f. Review and Amendment of SAF Bylaws
   i. These bylaws will be reviewed and amended (if necessary) within one year of the commencement of the program (i.e. before September 2014).
   ii. Notwithstanding 2f(i), review/amendment can be conducted as needed if the Chairs of the Departments so agree, or at the Dean's request.
   iii. Voting procedures are as defined in section 2c above.
   iv. Amendments do not come into effect until approved by Senate

g. Dispute Resolution
   i. Any member may initiate a dispute resolution process as described 2.g.iii.
   ii. Disputes will be resolved by the academic administrative levels at Ryerson University in the following order:
      1. The Dean's designate, if any
      2. The Dean
      3. The Provost